



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Solano County Water Agency	County	Solano
Project Title	Sacramento Valley Basin/Solano Subbasin Groundwater-Surface Water Flow Model to Evaluate Recharge & Conjunctive Water Use	Grant Request	\$ 249,580.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 249,580.00

Project Description: The Proposal develops a groundwater-surface water flow model to consider the potential effects of conjunctive water use scenarios and evaluates the effects of pumpage in the greater Solano area.

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	5
Work Plan	8
Budget	3
Schedule	5
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	35

- **GWMP or Program:** Applicant provided evidence its member agencies have adopted GWMPs with copies of applicable executed resolution signature pages. Furthermore, the agencies published an IRWMP, which has a groundwater management component and demonstrates close collaboration and agreement to manage water resources.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The criterion for the project description is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The applicant clearly describes the proposed project of the development and utilization of a numerical flow model to simulate surface water and groundwater movement in the Solano County area. The goals and location of the proposed project are clearly stated in the application. The proposed project will aid in evaluation of recharge in relation to pumping in Solano County and provide new information to create updated GWMP's for the area. SCWA has several member agencies which include Reclamation District No. 2068, Solano Irrigation District, City of Vacaville, and Maine Prairie Water District who work together along with DWR to manage the groundwater basin. The numeric flow model is planned to be fully operational and complete with the grant funds and does not anticipate needing additional funding after grant funds are expended.
- **Work Plan:** The criterion for the Work Plan is fully addressed, but is not thoroughly documented. The work plan tasks are described in great detail and the tasks support each of the GWMP's. The application fails to identify clear deliverables to DWR related to the project. The final report should be submitted to DWR along with a final grant report and invoices. It doesn't appear that grant management is fully accounted for in the work plan. The work plan is consistent with the budget and schedule.
- **Budget:** The criterion for the budget is not fully addressed and documentation is incomplete. There is a lack of explanatory text describing how the budget was derived and identifying how much grant amount is being requested versus how much cost match is. The section fails to explain what the material costs account for. No assumptions have been included nor a mention of who will carry out the work.
- **Schedule:** The criterion for the schedule is fully addressed. The project is set to start when funding is secured and the end date is within a reasonable amount of time. The schedule is well supported and matches the scope and budget. The application provides explanatory text defining how the schedule was derived.



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **QA/QC:** The criterion for the QA/QC is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The application claims that all tasks related to modeling efforts will follow methods outlined in the ASTM standards for data collection and checking, model development, calibration, and documentation. The calibration will be compared with observed groundwater levels to enhance the accuracy of the model. The model software is a tested and well established platform written by the USGS. Individuals that will work on this proposed project have professional certification and/or will be in direct supervision of professionally certified staff members.

- **Past Performance:** The criterion for the applicant's past performance is addressed, but not thoroughly documented. Some of the examples used are beyond the five year limit. The past performance projects are focused on what the project descriptions are rather than the applicant's interaction and performance with the State. The application doesn't explain the applicant's management of funds and meeting deadlines of those projects.